

App. Serial No. 10/511,512  
Docket No.: NL020321US

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**AUG 22 2007**

**Remarks**

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The instant Office Action dated May 22, 2007 indicated an objection to the title of the invention as not being descriptive, an objection to the abstract, an objection to claim 2, and listed the following rejections: claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tremblay (WO 00/33178); and claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tremblay in view of Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,479).

Regarding the objection to the title of the invention, Applicant has provided an amended title as indicated on page 2 of this paper. Applicant submits that the amended title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and is thus in compliance with M.P.E.P. §§ 606 and 606.01. As such, Applicant requests that the objection to the title be removed.

Regarding the objection to the abstract, Applicant has provided an amended abstract as indicated on page 3 of this paper. Applicant submits that the amended abstract is in compliance with M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b). Thus, Applicant requests that the objection to the abstract be removed.

Regarding the objection to claim 2, Applicant submits that the word "wherein" distinguishes the additions of claim 2 from the elements of claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 2 by adding the word "and" in line 2 as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant requests that the objection to claim 2 be removed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 3 because the cited portions of the Tremblay reference do not correspond to all of the claim limitations. For example, the Office Action mistakenly asserts that Tremblay's M-register file segments correspond to the claimed holdable registers and that Tremblay's N-register register file corresponds to the claimed register file. This assertion is incorrect, however, because no embodiment of the Tremblay reference contains both register files. More specifically, Tremblay teaches that the N-register file is duplicated into M-register file segments that are used as a replacement for a single N-register file (*i.e.*, both the N-register file and the M-register file segments are not present as is shown in Figure 5 by register file segments 510-516

App. Serial No. 10/511,512  
Docket No.: NL020321US

nor are they shown in Figure 6 by register file segments 610-616). Tremblay teaches using M-register file segments that each have N registers; these register file segments are not used in combination with the N-sized register file cited by the Office Action. Thus, the Office Action's assertion of correspondence fails as the Tremblay reference does not teach the concurrent use of both the N-register register file and the M-register file segments. Therefore, the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 3 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 2 because the cited portions of the Tremblay reference do not correspond to all of the claim limitations as discussed above relating to the Section 102(b) rejection of claim 1. In at least this regard, the rejection of claim 2 is improper because claim 2 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claim 1 and added new claims 4-7 which depend from claim 1. Applicant submits this newly claimed and amended subject matter better expresses the invention as exemplified in the Specification, and that claims 1-7 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102(b) and Section 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

App. Serial No. 10/511,512  
Docket No.: NI.020321US

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, David Cordeiro, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122

651-686-6633 x2300

(NXPS.305PA)